

FLATHEAD COUNTY PLANNING BOARD
COMMITTEE B
MEETING MINUTES
AUGUST 29, 2008

The meeting was called to order at 10:20 AM by Chairman Cross. Members in attendance were Gordon Cross, Rita Hall and Mike Mower. Marc Pittman was unable to attend. Jeff Harris of the FCPZ and Nikki Bond of the Whitefish Planning Department were also present. Mr. Cross gave an over view of the Committee's responsibilities as charged by the Planning Board. They involve three areas.

Overall Development Plan (ODP) standards

Appendix C of the Flathead County Growth Policy calls for the adoption of detailed standards for ODPs.

Update Zoning Regulations

The existing Flathead County Zoning Regulations were adopted in September of 1993 and an analysis and updating of these regulations has been identified as appropriate.

Whitefish interlocal agreement area jurisdiction transition

Jurisdiction of the area outside Whitefish municipal boundaries (referred to as the "interlocal agreement area") is to be transitioned to Flathead County. This is tentatively understood as of this date to mean:

- a. Amending the Flathead County Growth Policy to include jurisdiction over the interlocal agreement area.
- b. Determining if each existing zoning district is an appropriate implementation of the Flathead County Growth Policy.
- c. Determining how existing Whitefish zoning districts (such as WCR, WLR, WER, WBMR and WBMV) will be adopted or changed by Flathead County to implement the Flathead County Growth Policy. Examples of this include adopting one or all of the zones listed above to the Flathead County Zoning Regulations or finding an existing zone in the regulations to implement the growth policy in this area.
- d. Processing amendments to the Flathead County Zoning text and/or maps to accommodate the necessary revisions in the interlocal agreement area.

Cross suggested that the committee first consider the issue of the Whitefish Doughnut area due to their high priority. Everyone concurred.

No one wished to speak during the Public Comment Period.

Mike Mower and Jeff Harris gave an update on the deliberations of the County Transition Team that is studying the Doughnut Area. The team has had two meetings and they have agreed on the need to move as quickly as possible. They would like to have the transition completed by November 15th. One sticking point is the desire by people from Whitefish to have continued input on planning issues in the area. Mr. Harris handed out copies of a time table he had submitted to the Team. He reviewed the eight steps required to transfer control to the County.

Mr. Harris then gave an overview of community planning and the usual structure of Growth Policies and Zoning Regulations. Typically, zoning regulations are an implementation of a growth policy that is consistent with the pertinent maps and text. He stated that the 1987 Future Land Use Map is in the FCGP and that the 2000 map is also in compliance with the growth policy.

Discussion followed on all the issues involved with the county taking control over the area. It was decided that the county should move forward to adopt a new Whitefish Zoning District that would encompass the same area as the doughnut area. The new district should include a provision for a Land Use Advisory Board. A main subject was the many differences between the zoning designations in the city and the county. It was decided that the committee would follow two guidelines as they considered changes to the zoning map.

1. Lines of the various districts would not be altered.
2. In instances where it was necessary to change allowed densities, the minimum lot size should be lowered not raised.

A review of the Whitefish zoning designations in the doughnut area was conducted and County zoning designations were selected that most closely matched them. The following selections were made on a preliminary basis:

WA = SAG 10

WCR = New SAG 2.5

WSR = R-1

WER = R-2

WLR = R-3

WR-1 = R-3

WR-2 = R-4

WB-2 = B-2

WRR-1 = BR-4

WI = I-1 or I-2

WRPUD = see below

WBMV = see below

Committee members wanted to review differences in the permitted uses of the designations and the various bulk and dimensional requirements before making any final recommendations of these selections. The FCZP staff was asked to prepare a preliminary map to present to the committee and the Transition team at the next respective meetings. Mr. Harris explained that any approved PUDs and Neighborhood Plans (i.e. Big Mountain) would have to go through a county approval process to make them legal. The process could be somewhat truncated, but the county must have the opportunity to examine the individual characteristics before granting approval.

The Land Use Advisory Board was discussed. It was decided that the Transition Team should be asked to consider issues such as board makeup and election vs. appointment. The committee could then try to incorporate those suggestions into the zoning district proposal.

The next meeting was scheduled for Friday, September 5th at 9:00 AM in the county planning office. It was also decided to employ the county's video taping procedures for all future meetings.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:05 PM.

NOTE:

The following email was sent by Jeff Harris concerning the Committee's preliminary selections on Friday afternoon:

Hi committee

OK, we're making a new map showing proposed transition zoning. While going back through the designations we discussed this morning it became apparent that the residential zone classifications requiring water and sewer (R-3 and R-4) are a problem. I would suggest the R-2 for these since we can't obligate Whitefish water and sewer. This would include: WLR, WR-1, WR-2 and WR-3.

The 96 Plan gives some guidance in this area, including

- Suburban Residential (2 – 20 ac/ SFR dwelling unit (DU)) identifies

 - WCR, WSR, WER zoning districts

- Urban Residential (2 -10 DU/ac has WLR, WR-1, WR-2 tied to it

- High Density Residential (8 – 40 DU/ac) includes WR-3, WR-4

- Resort Residential up to 15 DU/ac includes WRR-1, WRR-2.

Looking at how they would work on the map, it appears that the R-2 is a better fit and more consistent fit with surrounding areas as well.

Any thoughts?